

A Linearithmic Time Algorithm for a Shortest Vector Problem in Compute-and-Forward Design

Jinming Wen* and Xiao-Wen Chang†

*ENS de Lyon, LIP, (CNRS, ENS de Lyon, Inria, UCBL), Lyon 69007, France, Email: jinming.wen@ens-lyon.fr

†School of Computer Science, McGill University, Montreal, H3A 2A7, Canada, E-mail: chang@cs.mcgill.ca

Abstract—We propose an algorithm with expected complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ arithmetic operations to solve a special shortest vector problem arising in computer-and-forward design, where n is the dimension of the channel vector. This algorithm is more efficient than the best known algorithms with proved complexity.

Index Terms—Shortest vector problem, Compute-and-forward, linearithmic time algorithm.

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we consider solving the following quadratic integer programming problem arising in compute-and-forward (CF) design:

$$\min_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{G} \mathbf{a}, \text{ where } \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{I} - \frac{P}{1 + P\|\mathbf{h}\|^2} \mathbf{h} \mathbf{h}^T, \quad (1)$$

where P , a constant, is the transmission power, $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a random channel vector following the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ and $\|\mathbf{h}\| = (\mathbf{h}^T \mathbf{h})^{1/2}$.

In relay networks, CF is a promising relaying strategy that can offer higher rates than traditional ones such as amplify-and-forward and decode-and-forward, especially in the moderate SNR regime. To find the optimal coefficient vector that maximizes the computation rate at a relay in CF scheme, we need to solve (1).

It is easy to verify that the matrix $\mathbf{G}$ in (1) is symmetric positive definite, so it has the Cholesky factorization $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{R}$, where $\mathbf{R}$ is an upper triangular matrix. Then we can rewrite (1) as a shortest vector problem (SVP):

$$\min_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \|\mathbf{R} \mathbf{a}\|^2. \quad (2)$$

The general SVP arises in many applications, including cryptography and communications, and there are different algorithms to solve it (see, e.g., [1], [2]). Although it has not been proved that the general SVP is NP-hard, it was shown in [3] that the SVP is NP-hard for randomized reductions. However, since the SVP (1) is special due to the structure of $\mathbf{G}$, efficient algorithms can be designed to solve it.

Various methods have been proposed for solving (1), including the branch-and-bound algorithm [4] (which did not use the properties of $\mathbf{G}$), the algorithm proposed in [5] and its improvement [6], which has the best known proved expected

complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.5} \log n)$ (In this paper, the complexity is measured by the number of arithmetic operations), the sphere decoding based algorithm given in [7], whose expected complexity is approximately $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.5})$. There are also some suboptimal algorithms, see [8], [9] and [10].

In this paper, we will modify the algorithm proposed in [6] for solving (1) to reduce the expected complexity to $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we review the algorithms proposed in [6] and [7] for solving (1). Then, in Section III, we propose a new algorithm. To compare these three algorithms computationally, we give numerical results in Section IV. Finally, conclusions are given in Section V.

Notation. We use $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbb{Z}^n$ to denote the spaces of the n -dimensional column real vectors and integer vectors, respectively, and $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ to denote the spaces of the $m \times n$ real matrices, respectively. Boldface lowercase letters denote column vectors and boldface uppercase letters denote matrices. For a vector $\mathbf{t}$, $\|\mathbf{t}\|$ denotes its ℓ^2 -norm. We use $\mathbf{e}_k$ to denote the k -th column of an $n \times n$ identity matrix $\mathbf{I}$, $\mathbf{e}$ to denote the n -dimensional vector with all of its elements being one and $\mathbf{0}$ denote the n -dimensional zero vector. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we use $\lceil x \rceil$ and $\lfloor x \rfloor$ respectively denote the smallest integer that is not smaller than x and the largest integer that is not larger than x . For $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we use $\lfloor \mathbf{t} \rfloor$ to denote its nearest integer vector, i.e., each entry of $\mathbf{t}$ is rounded to its nearest integer (if there is a tie, the one with smaller magnitude is chosen). For a set Φ , we use $|\Phi|$ denote its cardinality.

II. EXISTING ALGORITHMS

In this section, we review the algorithms proposed in [6] and [7] for solving (1).

A. The Algorithm of of Sahraei and Gastpar

In this subsection, we review the algorithm of Sahraei and Gastpar proposed in [6], which has the complexity $\mathcal{O}(n\psi \log(n\psi))$, where

$$\psi = \sqrt{1 + P\|\mathbf{h}\|^2}. \quad (3)$$

We will show that the expected complexity is $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.5} \log n)$ when $\mathbf{h}$, as it is assumed in computer-and-forward design, follows the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$. For the sake of convenience, we will refer to the algorithm as Algorithm SG.

This work was supported by NSERC of Canada grant 217191-12, "Programme Avenir Lyon Saint-Etienne de l'Université de Lyon" in the framework of the programme "Investissements d'Avenir" (ANR-11-IDEX-0007) and by ANR through the HPAC project under Grant ANR 11 BS02 013.

Given $\mathbf{h}$, we assume it is nonzero. Otherwise the problem (1) becomes trivial. We first simplify notation as [6] does. Let

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{h}\|} \mathbf{h}, \quad \alpha = \frac{P\|\mathbf{h}\|^2}{1 + P\|\mathbf{h}\|^2}. \quad (4)$$

Then $\|\mathbf{v}\| = 1$ and we can rewrite (1) as

$$\min_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{G} \mathbf{a}, \text{ where } \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{I} - \alpha \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}^T. \quad (5)$$

The algorithm in [6] is based on the following two theorems which were given in [11] and [5], respectively.

Theorem 1: The solution $\mathbf{a}^*$ to the SVP problem (5) satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{a}^*\| \leq \psi,$$

where ψ is defined in (3).

Theorem 2: The solution $\mathbf{a}^*$ to (5) is a standard unit vector, up to a sign, i.e., $\mathbf{a}^* = \pm \mathbf{e}_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, or satisfies

$$\mathbf{a}^* - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{e} < \mathbf{v} x < \mathbf{a}^* + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{e} \quad (6)$$

for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$, leading to

$$\mathbf{a}^* = \lceil \mathbf{v} x \rceil. \quad (7)$$

Define $\mathbf{a}(x) = \lceil \mathbf{v} x \rceil$, then for any $v_i \neq 0$, $a_i(x) = \lceil v_i x \rceil$ is a piecewise constant function of x and so is the objective function $f(\mathbf{a}(x)) = \mathbf{a}(x)^T \mathbf{G} \mathbf{a}(x)$. Thus, $f(\mathbf{a}(x))$ can be represented as

$$f(\mathbf{a}(x)) = \begin{cases} p_k, & \text{if } \xi_k < x < \xi_{k+1}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \\ q_k, & \text{if } x = \xi_k, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \end{cases}, \quad (8)$$

where ξ_k are sorted real numbers denoting the discontinuity points of $f(\mathbf{a}(x))$. By (8), $f(\mathbf{a}(x))$ is a constant for $x \in (\xi_k, \xi_{k+1})$. Thus, by (6),

$$f(\mathbf{a}^*) = \min_{k=0,1,\dots} f\left(\mathbf{a}\left(\frac{\xi_k + \xi_{k+1}}{2}\right)\right). \quad (9)$$

To reduce the computational cost, [6] looks at only part of the discontinuity points. It is easy to see that the discontinuity points of $a_i(x)$ are $x = \frac{c}{\lceil v_i \rceil}$ (where $v_i \neq 0$) for any $c - \frac{1}{2} \in \mathbb{Z}$, which are also the discontinuity points of the objective function $f(\mathbf{a}(x))$. Notice that if $\mathbf{a}^*$ is a solution, then $-\mathbf{a}^*$ is also a solution. (This fact was used in [12] to reduce the search cost.) Using this fact, [6] just considers only positive discontinuity points, i.e., only positive candidates for c are considered. Furthermore, from Theorem 1,

$$\lceil v_i x \rceil \leq \psi.$$

Thus one needs only to consider those c satisfying $0 < c \leq \lceil \psi \rceil + 1/2$ (this bound was given in [6] and it is easy to see actually it can be replaced by a slightly tighter bound $\lceil \psi \rceil + 1/2$). Therefore, if (6) holds, from (9), we have

$$f(\mathbf{a}^*) = \min_{\xi_k, \xi_{k+1} \in \Psi} f\left(\mathbf{a}\left(\frac{\xi_k + \xi_{k+1}}{2}\right)\right), \quad (10)$$

where

$$\Psi = \cup_{i=1}^n \Psi_i, \quad (11)$$

$$\Psi_i = \begin{cases} \emptyset & v_i = 0 \\ \left\{ \frac{c}{\lceil v_i \rceil} \mid 0 < c \leq \lceil \psi \rceil + \frac{1}{2}, c - \frac{1}{2} \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} & v_i \neq 0 \end{cases}. \quad (12)$$

The algorithm proposed in [6] for solving (5) calculates the set Ψ and sorts its elements in increasing order and then computes the right hand side of (10), and then compares it with $\min_i f(\pm \mathbf{e}_i)$, which is equal to $\min_i (1 - \alpha v_i^2)$, to get the solution.

By (5), for $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$,

$$f(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{G} \mathbf{a} = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 - \alpha \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i v_i \right)^2.$$

According to [6], since the discontinuity points of f are sorted and at each step only one of the a_i 's change, $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2$ and $\alpha \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i v_i \right)^2$ can be updated in constant time. Therefore, $f(\mathbf{a})$ can also be calculated in constant time. Here we make a remark. Actually different Ψ_i may have the same elements. But they can be regarded as different quantities when $f(\mathbf{a})$ is updated. In order to remember which a_i needs to be updated at each step, a label is assigned to every element of Ψ to indicate which Ψ_j it originally belonged to. In the new algorithm proposed in Section III, we will give more details about this idea.

Now we describe the complexity analysis given in [6] for the algorithm. By (12), the number of elements of Ψ_i is upper bounded by $\lceil \psi \rceil + 1$, so the number of elements of Ψ is upper bounded by $n(\lceil \psi \rceil + 1)$ (note that if $v_i \neq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, this is the exact number of elements). From the above analysis, the complexity of the algorithm is determined by the sorting step, which has the complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n\psi \log(n\psi))$, where ψ is defined in (3).

In the following, we derive the expected complexity of Algorithm SG when $\mathbf{h} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ by following [7]. Since $\mathbf{h} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$, $\|\mathbf{h}\|_2^2 \sim \chi^2(n)$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{h}\|_2^2] = n$. Since $\sqrt{1 + Px}$ is a concave function of x , by Jensen's Inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sqrt{1 + P\|\mathbf{h}\|_2^2}\right] \leq \sqrt{1 + nP}. \quad (13)$$

Thus, the expected complexity of Algorithm SG is $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.5} \log n)$.

B. The Algorithm of Wen, Zhou, Mow and Chang

In this subsection, we review the algorithm of Wen et al given in [7], an improvement of the earlier version given in [12]. Its complexity is approximated by $\mathcal{O}(n(\log n + \psi))$ based on the Gaussian heuristic, where ψ is defined in (3). By (13), the expected complexity is approximately $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.5})$ when $\mathbf{h} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$. For the sake of convenience, we will refer to the algorithm as Algorithm WZMC.

Again we want to simplify the matrix $\mathbf{G}$ in (1). Define

$$\mathbf{t} = \sqrt{\frac{P}{1 + P\|\mathbf{h}\|_2^2}} \mathbf{h} = \sqrt{\alpha} \mathbf{v}. \quad (14)$$

Then, (1) can be rewritten as

$$\min_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{G} \mathbf{a}, \text{ where } \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{t} \mathbf{t}^T. \quad (15)$$

Since $\mathbf{h} \neq \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{t} \neq \mathbf{0}$. Obviously, if $\mathbf{a}^*$ is a solution to (15), then so is $-\mathbf{a}^*$. Thus, for simplicity, only the solution $\mathbf{a}^*$ such that $\mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{a}^* \geq 0$ was considered in [12] and [7]. We also use this restriction throughout the rest of this paper.

In [7], (15) is first transformed to the standard form of the SVP (2) by finding the Cholesky factor $\mathbf{R}$ of $\mathbf{G}$ (i.e., $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{R}$) based on the following theorem.

Theorem 3: The Cholesky factor $\mathbf{R}$ of $\mathbf{G}$ in (15) is given by

$$r_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{g_i}{g_{i-1}}, & 1 \leq j = i \leq n \\ \frac{-t_i t_j}{g_{i-1} g_i}, & 1 \leq i < j \leq n \end{cases},$$

where $g_0 = 1$ and for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $g_i = \sqrt{1 - \sum_{k=1}^i t_k^2}$.

Instead of forming the whole $\mathbf{R}$ explicitly, only the diagonal entries of $\mathbf{R}$ were calculated, so it is easy to check that the complexity of this step is only $\mathcal{O}(n)$.

It was showed in [4] that if

$$t_1 \geq t_2 \geq \dots \geq t_n \geq 0, \quad (16)$$

then there exists a solution $\mathbf{a}^*$ to (15) satisfying

$$a_1^* \geq a_2^* \geq \dots \geq a_n^* \geq 0. \quad (17)$$

Given $\mathbf{t}$, if $t_i < 0$ for some i , we can change it to $-t_i$ without changing anything else. To have the order (16), we can permute the entries of $\mathbf{t}$. This step costs $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$.

To decrease the computational cost, the following $(n+1)$ -dimensional vector $\mathbf{p}$ was introduced in [7]:

$$p_{n+1} = 0, \quad p_i = p_{i+1} + t_i a_i, \quad i = n, n-1, \dots, 1.$$

Define

$$d_n = 0, \quad d_i = -\frac{1}{r_{ii}} \sum_{j=i+1}^n r_{ij} a_j, \quad i = n-1, \dots, 1.$$

Then, by Theorem 3,

$$d_i = \frac{t_i}{g_i} \sum_{j=i+1}^n t_j a_j = \frac{1}{g_i} t_i p_{i+1}, \quad i = n-1, \dots, 1.$$

Thus,

$$\|\mathbf{R} \mathbf{a}\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n r_{ii}^2 (a_i - d_i)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n r_{ii}^2 \left(a_i - t_i p_{i+1} / g_i \right)^2$$

The Schnorr-Euchner search algorithm [13] was modified to search the optimal solution satisfying (17) within the ellipsoid:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n r_{ii}^2 (a_i - t_i p_{i+1} / g_i)^2 < f(\mathbf{e}_1) = 1 - t_1^2.$$

If no nonzero integer point is found, $\mathbf{e}_1$ is the solution. The cost of the search process was approximately $\mathcal{O}(n\psi)$ based on the Gaussian heuristic. Thus, by the above analysis and (13), the expected complexity of Algorithm WZMC is approximated by $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.5})$ when $\mathbf{h} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$.

III. NEW ALGORITHM

In this section, we propose an algorithm with complexity of $\mathcal{O}((n + \min\{\sqrt{n}, \varphi\} \varphi) \log(n + \min\{\sqrt{n}, \varphi\} \varphi))$, where

$$\varphi = \sqrt{1 + P(\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 - \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} h_i^2)}. \quad (18)$$

By (3) and (13), the expected complexity is $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ when $\mathbf{h} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$.

Recall that Algorithm SG checks some discontinuity points of the objective function to find the optimal solution. The main idea of our new algorithm is to reduce the number of discontinuity points to be checked.

In this following, we introduce a theorem, which can significantly reduce the number of discontinuity points to be checked in finding the optimal one.

Theorem 4: Suppose that $\mathbf{t}$ satisfies

$$t_1 = \dots = t_p > t_{p+1} \geq \dots \geq t_q > t_{q+1} = \dots = t_n = 0, \quad (19)$$

where both p and q can be 1 or n . Then the solution $\mathbf{a}^*$ to (15) satisfies either

$$\mathbf{a}^* = \pm \mathbf{e}_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq p,$$

or

$$\mathbf{a}^* = \pm \lceil \mathbf{t} x \rceil$$

for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\frac{1}{2t_2} \leq x \leq \mu, \quad (20)$$

where

$$\mu = \min_{1 \leq i \leq q} \left(\frac{1}{t_i} \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\sqrt{i}} \sqrt{\frac{1 - t_1^2}{1 - \|\mathbf{t}\|^2}} \right\rfloor + \frac{1}{2t_i} \right). \quad (21)$$

Proof. Note that for $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} f(\pm \mathbf{e}_i) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} (1 - t_i^2) = 1 - t_k^2 = f(\pm \mathbf{e}_k).$$

It is possible that $\pm \mathbf{e}_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, p$ are solutions to (15). In the following proof we assume they are not.

By (14) and Theorem 2, there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the solution can be written as $\mathbf{a}^* = \lceil \mathbf{t} x \rceil$. Note that if $\lceil \mathbf{t} x \rceil$ is a solution, so is $-\lceil \mathbf{t} x \rceil$. Thus we can just assume that x here is positive. Then by (19) we have

$$a_1^* = \dots = a_p^* \geq a_{p+1}^* \geq \dots \geq a_q^* \geq a_{q+1}^* = \dots = a_n^* = 0. \quad (22)$$

We must have $a_2^* \geq 1$, otherwise $\mathbf{a}^* = \mathbf{e}_1$, contradicting with our assumption. Thus,

$$t_2 x \geq a_2^* - \frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore, the first inequality in (20) holds.

In the following, we show that the second inequality in (20) holds. Since $\mathbf{e}_1$ is not an optimal solution, $f(\mathbf{a}^*) < f(\mathbf{e}_1)$, i.e.,

$$\|\mathbf{a}^*\|^2 - (\mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{a}^*)^2 < 1 - t_1^2.$$

Therefore, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\|\mathbf{a}^*\|^2 < \frac{1 - t_1^2}{1 - \|\mathbf{t}\|^2}. \quad (23)$$

By (22), for $i = 1, \dots, q$,

$$\|\mathbf{a}^*\|^2 \geq i(a_i^*)^2. \quad (24)$$

Then, using the fact that $\mathbf{a}^* = \lceil \mathbf{t}x \rceil$ and (23) and (24), we have

$$t_i x \leq a_i^* + \frac{1}{2} \leq \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\sqrt{i}} \sqrt{\frac{1 - t_1^2}{1 - \|\mathbf{t}\|^2}} \right\rfloor + \frac{1}{2}.$$

Since the aforementioned equality holds for all $i = 1, \dots, q$, the second inequality in (20) holds, completing the proof. $\square$

Like Algorithm WZMC, our new algorithm first performs a transformation on $\mathbf{t}$ in (15) such that (19) holds, costing $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$.

We define $\mathbf{a}(x) = \lceil \mathbf{t}x \rceil$ (cf. Section II-A). Then for any $i = 1, \dots, q$, where q is defined in (19)), $a_i(x) = \lceil t_i x \rceil$ is a piecewise constant function of x and its discontinuity points are $x = \frac{c}{t_i}$ where $c - \frac{1}{2} \in \mathbb{Z}$. To find the optimal discrete points, we need consider only a finite subset of those discrete points. In fact, by Theorem 4, we need to consider only those $x = c/t_i$, where c satisfies

$$\frac{t_i}{2t_2} \leq c \leq t_i \mu, \quad c - \frac{1}{2} \in \mathbb{Z}$$

Thus, we define

$$\Phi = \bigcup_{i=1}^q \Phi_i, \quad (25)$$

where

$$\Phi_i = \left\{ \left(\frac{c}{t_i}, i \right) \mid \frac{t_i}{2t_2} \leq c \leq t_i \mu, c - \frac{1}{2} \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}. \quad (26)$$

Then the optimal discontinuity point and its position in the vector $\mathbf{a}(x)$ must be in Φ . We sort the first elements of the members of Φ in increasing order, then by (16), only one entry of $\mathbf{a}$ increase 1 for each element in Φ (note that if some of the entries of $\mathbf{t}$ are the same, then the corresponding Φ_i have the same x , but we can regard them as different quantities to update $\mathbf{a}$ and the corresponding $f(\mathbf{a}(x))$). By following [6], we can compute $f(\mathbf{a}(x))$ for each x by constant time. Specifically, denote $T_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2$ and $T_2 = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i t_i$, then $f(\mathbf{a}(x)) = T_1 - T_2^2$. We start from $T_1 = T_2 = 0$ and $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{0}$, and for each $(x, i) \in \Phi$, we update $\mathbf{a}$ by setting $a_i = a_i + 1$, then we update T_1 by setting $T_1 = T_1 + 2a_i - 1$, update T_2 by setting $T_2 = T_2 + t_i$, and update f by setting $f = T_1 - T_2^2$. During the enumeration process, we only keep the $\mathbf{a}$ which minimizes f and the corresponding f . If $f < 1 - t_1^2$, then the final $\mathbf{a}$ is $\mathbf{a}^*$, otherwise, $\mathbf{a}^* = \mathbf{e}_1$.

By the above analysis, the algorithm can be summarized in Algorithm 1.

Before analyzing the complexity of Algorithm 1, we look into the number of discontinuous points needed to be checked

Algorithm 1 New Algorithm

Input: Channel vector $\mathbf{h}$ and transmission power P

Output: $\mathbf{a}^*$

Initialization:

1: calculate $\mathbf{t}$ by (14)

2: perform a signed permutation on $\mathbf{t}$ such that the new $\mathbf{t}$ satisfies (19)

3: calculate μ by (21)

4: let $\Phi = \emptyset$, $f_{\min} = 1 - t_1^2$, $\mathbf{a}^* = \mathbf{e}_1$

Phase 1:

5: **for** all $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ **do**

6: **for** all $c - 1/2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $t_i/(2t_2) \leq c \leq t_i \mu$ **do**

7: calculate $x = c/t_i$

8: $\Phi = \Phi \cup (x, i)$

9: **end for**

10: **end for**

Phase 2:

11: sort Φ by the first element of the members in an increasing order

12: set $T_1 = 0$, $T_2 = 0$ and $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{0}$.

13: **for** every $(x, i) \in \Phi$ **do**

14: $a_i = a_i + t_i$

15: $T_1 = T_1 + 2a_i - 1$

16: $T_2 = T_2 + t_i$

17: $f = T_1 - T_2^2$

18: **if** $f < f_{\min}$ **then**

19: set $\mathbf{a}^* = \mathbf{a}$

20: set $f_{\min} = f$

21: **end if**

22: **end for**

23: **return** sign permuted $\mathbf{a}^*$

by Algorithm 1 and Algorithm SG. By (21), (14) and (18), for $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} t_i \mu - \frac{1}{2} &\leq \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\sqrt{i}} \sqrt{\frac{1 - t_1^2}{1 - \|\mathbf{t}\|^2}} \right\rfloor \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\sqrt{i}} \sqrt{1 + P(\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 - \max_j h_j^2)} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\sqrt{i}} \varphi \right\rfloor, \end{aligned}$$

where the “max” is involved because t_1^2 is the largest among all t_i^2 after the permutation of $\mathbf{t}$ (see (16)). Thus, by (26),

$$|\Phi_i| \leq \left\lfloor \varphi / \sqrt{i} \right\rfloor + 1. \quad (27)$$

By (12), for $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$,

$$|\Psi_i| = \lceil \psi \rceil + 1, \quad (28)$$

where ψ is defined in (3).

Thus, from (27), (28), (3) and (18), it follows that

$$\frac{|\Phi_i|}{|\Psi_i|} \leq \frac{\lfloor \varphi / \sqrt{i} \rfloor + 1}{\lceil \psi \rceil + 1} < 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, q$$

Note that φ can be arbitrarily smaller than ψ (see (3) and (18)). Also when i is big enough, $\lfloor \varphi / \sqrt{i} \rfloor = 0$. Thus the new

algorithm can significantly reduce the number of discontinuity points to be checked.

Now we study the complexity of Algorithm 1. By (27), when $i > \lfloor \varphi^2 \rfloor$, $|\Phi_i| = 0$. Then, with $k = \min\{q, \lfloor \varphi^2 \rfloor\}$, by (27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi| &= \sum_{i=1}^q |\Phi_i| \leq \varphi \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{\sqrt{i}} + q \leq \varphi \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{i-1}^i \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} dx + q \\ &= 2\sqrt{k}\varphi + q \leq 2\min\{\sqrt{n}, \varphi\}\varphi + n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the complexity of line 11 of Algorithm 1 is $\mathcal{O}((n + \min\{\sqrt{n}, \varphi\}\varphi) \log(n + \min\{\sqrt{n}, \varphi\}\varphi))$. It is easy to see it is actually the complexity of the whole algorithm. Then it follows from (3), (18) and (13) that the expected complexity of Algorithm 1 is $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ when $\mathbf{h} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$.

IV. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In this section, we present numerical results to compare the efficiency of our proposed method Algorithm 1 (denoted by "Proposed") with those in [6] (denoted by "SG") and [7] (denoted by "WZMC"). We do not compare Algorithm 1 with the branch-and-bound algorithm in [4] since numerical tests in [7] show that the algorithm in [5] is faster, while the algorithm in [6] is an improved version of that in [5]. All the numerical tests were done by MATLAB 2010a on a laptop with Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-5300U CPU@ 2.30GHz.

We set the dimension n of $\mathbf{h}$ being 10, 20, ..., 80 and $\mathbf{h} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$. For each given n and P , we randomly generate 1000 realizations of $\mathbf{h}$ and apply the three algorithms to solve (1). Figure 1 shows the total CPU time for $P = 1$.




Fig. 1. Total CPU time versus n for $P = 1$

From Figure 1, we can see that the total CPU time for the proposed method and WZMC are very close, so for comparisons we also give Table I to show the total CPU time for $P = 50$.

From Figure 1 and Table I, we can see that our proposed algorithm is much faster than SG, and it is also faster than WZMC if both n and P are not very large which means the new algorithm and WZMC have advantages in different

TABLE I
TOTAL CPU TIME IN SECONDS VERSUS n FOR $P = 50$

n	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80
SG	2.77	6.28	13.3	23.5	41.4	62.7	93.7	130
Proposed	0.96	1.40	2.06	2.60	3.42	4.15	5.14	6.07
WZMC	1.72	2.31	2.28	2.49	2.62	2.77	3.14	3.42

settings, so both of them are useful. Algorithm 1 has another advantage, i.e., its complexity can be rigorously analyzed, while the complexity for WZMC was based on Gaussian heuristic.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we proposed an algorithm with the expected complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ for a shortest vector problem arising in compute-and-forward network coding design. The complexity is lower than $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.5} \log n)$, the expected complexity of the latest algorithm in [6] and $\mathcal{O}(n^{1.5})$, the approximate expected complexity of the algorithm proposed in [7]. Simulation results showed that the new algorithm is much faster than that given in [6].

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Agrell, T. Eriksson, A. Vardy, and K. Zeger, "Closest point search in lattices," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 2201–2214, 2002.
- [2] G. Hanrot, X. Xavier Pujol, and D. Stehlé, "Algorithms for the shortest and closest lattice vector problems," in *Proceedings of the third international conference on coding and cryptology (IWCC'11)*. Springer-Verlag Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 159–190.
- [3] M. Ajtai, "The shortest vector problem in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ is np-hard for randomized reductions," in *Proceedings of the thirtieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. ACM, 1998, pp. 10–19.
- [4] J. Richter, C. Scheunert, and E. Jorswieck, "An efficient branch-and-bound algorithm for compute-and-forward," in *IEEE 23rd International Symposium on Personal Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications (PIMRC'12)*, Sept 2012, pp. 77–82.
- [5] S. Sahraei and M. Gastpar, "Compute-and-forward: Finding the best equation," in *2014 52nd Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 227–233.
- [6] —, "Polynomially solvable instances of the shortest and closest vector problems with applications to compute-and-forward," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.06667*, 2015.
- [7] J. Wen, B. Zhou, W. Mow, and X.-W. Chang, "An efficient algorithm for optimally solving a shortest vector problem in compute-and-forward design," *submitted to IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*.
- [8] A. Sakzad, E. Viterbo, Y. Hong, and J. Boutros, "On the ergodic rate for compute-and-forward," in *2012 International Symposium on Network Coding (NetCod)*, 2012, pp. 131–136.
- [9] B. Zhou and W. Mow, "A quadratic programming relaxation approach to compute-and-forward network coding design," in *The 2014 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT'2014)*, 2014, pp. 2296–2300.
- [10] B. Zhou, J. Wen, and W. Mow, "A quadratic programming relaxation approach to compute-and-forward network coding design," *submitted to IEEE Transactions on Communications*.
- [11] B. Nazer and M. Gastpar, "Compute-and-forward: Harnessing interference through structured codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 6463–6486, 2011.
- [12] J. Wen, B. Zhou, W. Mow, and X.-W. Chang, "Compute-and-Forward design based on improved sphere decoding," in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Communications, ICC 2015, London, United Kingdom, June 8-12, 2015*, 2015, pp. 1631–1636.
- [13] C. Schnorr and M. Euchner, "Lattice basis reduction: improved practical algorithms and solving subset sum problems," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 66, pp. 181–191, 1994.